

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/749,378	01/02/2004	Kobayashi Shozo	1594.1303	9137		
21171	7590 08/08/2005		EXAMINER			
	IALSEY LLP	LEUNG, PHILIP H				
SUITE 700 1201 NEW Y	ORK AVENUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3742	3742		

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					Т	went		
		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/749,3	78	SHOZO ET AL.				
		Examine	,	Art Unit				
		Philip H. L		3742				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with t	he correspondence add	ress			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATE arsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cr SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicating e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no eviction.  s, a reply within the state period will apply and were statute, cause the apply and were statute, cause the apply and were statute.	ent, however, may a reply utory minimum of thirty (30 ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS lication to become ABANE	be timely filed  O) days will be considered timely. From the mailing date of this condoned (25 U.S.C. § 133).	, nmunicati	ion.		
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	18 July 2005	•					
·		This action is n	on-final.					
3)								
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-14,20-23,25 and 26</u> is/are Claim(s) <u>8,15-19 and 24</u> is/are objected to Claim(s) are subject to restriction and continuous expectations.	thdrawn from co rejected. o.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b)	objected to by	the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection t	to the drawing(s) t	e held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the common the oath or declaration is objected to by the common terms of the common ter		- ;	•		(d).		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu  2. Certified copies of the priority docu  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B	iments have bee iments have bee e priority docume Bureau (PCT Rul	en received. en received in Appl ents have been rec e 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National S	stage	·		
Attachmen	' '		_					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	40)		mary (PTO-413) ail Date				
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S er No(s)/Mail Date			mal Patent Application (PTO-	152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/749,378 Page 2

Art Unit: 3742

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fioroli (GB 2 112 610) (newly cited).

Fioroli shows a microwave convectional oven comprising a cabinet to define a cooking cavity 1 therein, the cooking cavity being open at a front thereof; a fan chamber 5 defined by recessing a rear wall 4 of the cooking cavity at a predetermined area to a predetermined depth; an air circulation fan 6 installed in the fan chamber to circulate air of the cooking cavity; a heater 7 installed in the fan chamber to heat the air; and a chamber cover 3 mounted to the rear wall of the cooking cavity to cover an open front of the fan chamber, the chamber cover having a plurality of air suction ports 11 (area A) at a central area thereof, with a plurality of air distribution ports 11 (areas B and/or C) provided along an edge of the chamber cover to guide the air from the fan chamber to the edge of the chamber cover to discharge the air to the cooking cavity. As all of the plurality of air distribution ports are provided along the edge of the chamber cover therefore it is inherent that the air is not directly forced onto food in the cooking cavity (see Figures 1-4 and page 1, line 86 – page 2, line 76). In regard to claim 26, see page 2, lines 114-129.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Fioroli (GB 2 112 610), in view of McFadden et al (US 6,376,817) (previously cited).

As set forth above, Fioroli shows every feature as claimed except for the shape of the air distribution ports. McFadden shows that it is well known in the art of microwave convectional ovens to form the air distribution ports in the shape of protuberant nozzles 26 to increase air speed toward the food more directly (see Figure 1, col. 6, lines 10-67 and col. 7, lines 41-56). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Fioroli to use protuberant nozzles as air distribution ports for better heating efficiency and better baking result, in view of the teaching of McFadden.

5. Claims 4, 6, 7, 9-12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Fioroli (GB 2 112 610), in view of Takakura (JP 56-102623) (previously cited).

As set forth above, Fioroli shows every feature as claimed except for the use of a coating on the chamber surfaces. Takakura shows that it is well known in the art of microwave ovens to coat the oven chamber surfaces with an insulating material to prevent generation of sparks in the oven (see Figure 1 and the English abstract). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Fioroli to use a coating on the chamber surfaces to reduce sparks for a safer microwave cooking device, in view of the

teaching of Takakura. In regard to claims 6, 7 and 12, Fioroli also shows the use of setscrews for mounting the fan assembly (see Figure 4 and page 2, lines 49-62). The exact arrangement would be a matter of engineering variations. In regard to claim 23, the use of a fan for cooling the magnetron and the transformer of a microwave oven is considered essential and routine in the art to prevent overheating of these components.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fioroli (GB 2 112 610), in view of Takakura (JP 56-102623), as applied to claims 4, 6, 7, 9-12 and 23 above, and further in view of McFadden et al (US 6,376,817).

As set forth above, Fioroli combined with Takakura shows every feature as claimed except for the shape of the air distribution ports. McFadden shows that it is well known in the art of microwave convectional ovens to form the air distribution ports in the shape of protuberant nozzles 26 to increase air speed toward the food more directly (see Figure 1, col. 6, lines 10-67 and col. 7, lines 41-56). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Fioroli combined with Takakura to use protuberant nozzles as air distribution ports for better heating efficiency and better baking result, in view of the teaching of McFadden.

7. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fioroli (GB 2 112 610), in view of Takakura (JP 56-102623), as applied to claims 4, 6, 7, 9-12 and 23 above, and further in view of Yasuoka (US 3,692,968) (previously cited).

As set forth above, Fioroli combined with Takakura shows every feature as claimed except for the use of a mode stirrer. Yasuoka shows that it is well known in the art of microwave ovens to use a mode stirrer for stirring the microwave supplied from the magnetron to the cooking chamber (see Figures 1 and 4 and col. 2, line 58 - col. 3, line 3). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Fioroli to use a rotating stirrer for stirring the microwave radiation pattern for more uniform and better cooking result, in view of the teaching of Yasuoka.

8. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Fioroli (GB 2 112 610)), in view of Fleiter et al (US 4,970,372) (previously cited).

As set forth above, Fioroli shows every feature as claimed except for the use of a heat shield mounted on the outer surface of the cooking chamber. Fleiter shows that it is well known in the art of convectional ovens to use a heat shield 14 between the fan motor12 and the fan chamber 10 to protect the motor (see the Figure and col. 3, lines 32-46). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Fioroli to use a heat shield to protect the motor from overheating, in view of the teaching of Fleiter.

9. Claims 8, 15-19 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip H Leung whose telephone number is (571) 272-4782.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on (571) 472-4777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip H Leung Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

P.Leung/pl 7-31-2005